716 10-15-02 P. Z

PIERCE ATWOOD

FAX RECEIVED

OCT 1 5 2002

GROUP 1600

FAX COVER SHEET

To: Ex'r Peter Paras, Art Unit 1632

Entity: USPTO

Fax Number: 703 308 4242 Voice Number: 703 308 8340

From: Jonathan Hines

Date and Time: October 11, 2002 1:15 PM

Total Pages: 6

OFFICIAL

Message: Per our phone conversation, please find attached a copy of the response which was filed on April 25, 2002 in Patent Application No. 09/749,709. A copy of the facsmilie transmission report is also attached.

Regards,

Jonathan M. Hines

Any message on this fax cover sheet, and any accompanying materials, may contain confidential, secret or privileged information, the disclosure, copying, or further dissemination of which is strictly prohibited under applicable law. Therefore, if this fax cover sheet is not addressed to you or if this fax cover sheet is addressed to you, but the accompanying materials do not appear to be intended for you, please do not read, copy or disseminate either any message on the fax cover sheet or the accompanying materials. Instead, please call us collect at 207.791-1279, and we will make arrangements for return of these materials at our expense.

If you are having difficulties in receiving this, please call us at 207.791-1279. Thank you.

For Pierce Atwood Office Use Only Client-Matter Number: 8888-3010

Auto-Reply Facsimile Transmission



84/25/86 TD:33:66

TO:

Fax Sender at 2077911350

Fax Information

Date Received:

4/25/02 4:32:33 PM [Eastern Daylight Time]

Total Pages: 4 (including cover page)

ADVISORY: This is an automatically generated return receipt confirmation of the facsimile transmission received by the Office. Please check to make sure that the number of pages listed as received in Total Pages above matches what was intended to be sent. Applicants are advised to retain this receipt in the unlikely event that proof of this facsimile transmission is necessary. Applicants are also advised to use the certificate of facsimile transmission procedures set forth in 37 CFR 1.8(a) and (b), 37 CFR 1.6(f). Trademark Applicants, also see the Trademark Manual of Examining Procedure (TMEP) section 702.04 et seq.

Received Cover Page OFR 25 2002 15137 FR PIERCE ATLANTO

2077311350 TO 917659729364

. B1/64

PIERCE ATWOOD

FAX COVER SHEET

To: Examiner Peter Paras, Art Unit 1632
Entity: U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Fax Number: 703-872-9306 Voice Number: 703-308-8340

Voice Number: 703-308-8340
From: Patrick Scanlin
Date and Time: April 25, 2002 3:37 PM

Tom! Pages: 4

Message:

PLEASE SES ATTACHED RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION IN PATENT APPLICATION NO. 09/149,709

IMPCATANT MERILAGE. Any meshage on this by cores sheet, and any addression reasons, may consume consistential, secret or philaged information, the decicionite, copping, or further disservingsion of which is shown prohibited under applicable law. Therefore, if was few cover sheet is not addressed to you on it file his cover since is a addressed to you be the consumptiving mutachis for not proper to be untineed for you, place to community the mutachist for not proper to be untineed for you, place to community and mutachist for not proper to be understood by you. Send the confidence of the addression of the few cover sheet or the accompanying material. Messad, tracked body or dissended at 207,791.11 00, settlement 270, and we will make attrappearable for return of these materials at our countries.

For Plante Alegard Olice Use Only - Clantatoner Number 19412-177)

One Monument Square . Portland, Malor 02201 - 207 791 1100 . Fax 207.791 1250

Received from < 2077011350 > at 4.03407413131 PM (Summon Onyllight Time)

19412-1773001

Serial No. 09/749,709

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of

Chengyu Liu et al.

:Group Art Unit: 1632

Serial No. 09/749,709

:Examiner: P. Paras

Filed: December 27, 2000

:Response to Paper No. 5

For

CONTROLLING OFFSPRING'S

SEX RATIO BY TARGETING TRANSGENES ONTO THE SEX CHROMOSOMES

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT UNDER 35 U.S.C. 121

Assistant Commissioner for Patents,

Washington, DC 20231

SIR:

This is in response to the Office Action dated March 26, 2002. Claims 1-12 remain pending in the present application.

Restriction has been required between (I) claims 1-12, drawn to a method of producing transgenic animals, wherein the animals are mammals, (II) claims 1-12, drawn to a method of producing transgenic animals, wherein the animals are non-mammalian, and (III) claims 1 and 2, drawn to a method of producing transgenic animals, wherein the animals are unisexual flower plants. This restriction requirement is respectfully traversed.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION (37 CFR 1.8 (2))	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being:	
Signatu	transmitted by facelimile to the Petent and Trademark Office Link R. Leanlon The Company of th

Serial No. 09/749,709

The Examin r states that restriction is proper between Groups I, II and III because their inventions "appear" to constitute patentably distinct inventions. The Examiner further states that a separate search is required for each of groups I, II and III.

As an initial point, applicant respectfully disagrees that a separate search is necessarily required for each group. By the Examiner's own statement, Groups I and II are both classifiable in class 800, subclass 25. Thus, there is no indication that a separate search would be required for at least these two Groups.

Moreover, applicant disagrees that the Groups identified by the Examiner are distinct inventions. In MPEP § 802.01, the term "distinct" is defined as meaning that two or more subjects as disclosed are related, but are capable of separate manufacture, use or sale <u>as claimed</u>. Here, the allegedly distinct inventions, as claimed, are not capable of separate manufacture, use or sale because they are <u>defined by the same claims</u>. That is, Groups I and II are both defined by the same claims 1-12 and Group III is defined by claims 1 and 2, which comprise a subset of claims 1-12. Thus, the Groups are not distinct as claimed. As stated in MPEP § 806, restriction is never proper where inventions are related as disclosed but not distinct as claimed.

In addition, MPEP § 803 states that restriction between two or more inventions is proper only if they are able to support separate patents. In this case, it is respectfully submitted that Groups I, II and III could not support separate patents because they are defined by the same claims and 35 U.S.C. 101 precludes more than one patent being issued for the same claims.

For the above reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction requirement is respectfully requested.

Serial No. 09/749,709

Applicant provisionally elects Group I, claims 1-12 for further prosecution.

An action on the merits is awaited.

Respectfully submitted,

Doto

Date

Patrick R. Fearlon
Patrick R. Scanlon

Reg. No. 34,500

Pierce Atwood

One Monument Square Portland, Maine 04101

207-791-1276